

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are presented for further examination. Claims 1, 11, and 13-20 have been amended.

In the Office Action mailed November 3, 2004, and again in the final Office Action mailed June 16, 2005, the Examiner objected to the oath/declaration as defective because it did not state that the person making the oath or declaration acknowledges the duty to disclose to the Office all information all information known to the person to be material to patentability as required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56. Applicant is submitting herewith a new Declaration.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,219,830 ("Eidt et al.").

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the basis for the rejection and requests reconsideration and further examination of the claims.

As discussed in the Amendment filed February 3, 2005, the present invention provides a method for linking a plurality of object code modules to form an executable program, and a resulting computer product is also provided. The present invention utilizes novel relocation instructions during the linking process that avoids the same calculation being passed to a linker many times over. More particularly, in the present method and resulting computer product, symbol attributes are used to rewrite the code during the linking process.

This feature was not addressed by the Examiner in the final Office Action, perhaps because it was associated with the preamble. Applicant has amended the independent claims so that this feature is now recited in the body of these claims. In contrast, Eidt et al. pertains to a loader program applied to a relocatable object code format produced by a compiler prior to linking.

Eidt et al. describe at column 1, lines 24-36, the steps in passing from a computer program written in source code to execution of the program on a computer system to be as follows:

- (1) one or more source code modules are passed through a compiler or assembler that generates one or more object code files as an output;

(2) a linker routine, which is either a separate program or is part of the compiler, combines the source code modules into a single output file, known as an “executable” object code file; and

(3) one or more executables are then loaded together into memory by a loader program, and control is then transferred to a start address to initiate program execution.

As discussed above, the present invention relates to the linker routine in step 2, while relocatable object code format and method for loading same into the computer system Eidt et al.’s relates to the linker program of step 3. This is clear from the summary of the invention section of Eidt et al. at column 4, lines 54-67, which specifies that the invention takes advantage of certain characteristics of executable object code files to drastically reduce the number of bytes of relocation information that are required per relocation. In order to obtain the desired result, Eidt et al. disclose a loader program as described at column 9, line 34 through column 19, line 33, which may be applied to a re-locatable object code file format produced by a compiler prior to linking (step 1) at column 19, lines 26-33.


Independent claims 1, 11, and 13-20 have all been amended to clearly recite a method for a computer program product for linking a plurality of the object code modules to form an executable program. Claim 1 recites linking the object code modules to include, in the linking process, reading at least one relocation instruction, etc. Nowhere in Eidt et al. is there any disclosure or suggestion that relates to forming an executable program using a linker, and in particular to use of symbol attributes when forming an executable program, and particularly during the linking process. Rather, Eidt et al. only disclose performing relocations before or after the linking process. As such, the present invention is clearly novel and nonobvious over the teachings of Eidt et al.

Applicant further notes that the Eidt et al. reference was cited in the European standard search report as being in category A, *i.e.*, of only technological background to the presently claimed invention. Thus, it is clear that Eidt et al. do not relate to the optimization of the linking process and in fact provide no detailed description of the linking process and how it might be achieved as set forth in claims 1-20.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-20 are clearly in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner disagrees, applicant requests a telephone interview with the Examiner, or the Examiner is urged to contact applicant's undersigned representative by telephone at (206) 622-4900 in order to expeditiously resolve prosecution of this application. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing this case to issuance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC



E. Russell Tarleton
Registration No. 31,800

ERT:jk

Enclosure:
Postcard

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 6300
Seattle, Washington 98104-7092
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031

725660_1.DOC